

statements;
creating a plurality of audio responses for articulation by said simulated person; and
creating logic means for interrelating each of said audio responses, said simulated person and said plurality of statements to be verbalized by the user, such that each of said statements can have a plurality of different audio responses and video vignettes associated therewith, said logic means comprising a personality profile emulator comprising an emotional model of said simulated person for controlling the selection of one of said plurality of audio responses and one of said plurality of video vignettes in response to user verbalized ones of said plurality of statements.

Cancel claims 17-21, 38-42, 44-48, 51, and 54-59.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 22, 23, 35, 36, 43, and 60-65 have been amended to recite that the logic means comprises a personality profile/emulator/emulation comprising an emotional model of a simulated person for controlling the selection of one of the plurality of audio responses and one of the plurality of video vignettes in response to one of the plurality of statements being selected by the user. Support can be found in the claims and in the specification, page 7, lines 25-31; page 8, lines 1-4; page 10, lines 22-31; and page 11, lines 1-3. Claims 17-21, 38-42, 44-48, 51, and 54-59 have been canceled.

Claims 1-16, 22-37, 43, 49, 50, 52, and 60-65 remain under consideration in the application.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

Applicant has canceled the non-elected claims.

103 REJECTIONS

a. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 43, and 61-63 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. (US 5,864,844) in view of Best (US5358259).

Neither James et al. nor Best discloses a personality profile emulator comprising an emotional model of the simulated person for controlling the selection of audio and video responses in response to the user selected statements.

Applicant has amended all independent claims remaining under consideration to recite this distinction and, therefore, James et al. in view of Best does not render obvious independent claims 1, 14, 43, and 61-63, or, as a result, claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10, and 15 which depend therefrom.

b. The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 7, 8, 11-13, 16, 22-37, 49, 50, and 52 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. (US 5864844) in view of Harless (US 5730603) and further in view of Best (US 5358259).

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 22, and 35 as discussed above. Because James et al., Harless and Best in combination do not disclose or suggest a system that utilizes a personality profile emulator comprising an emotional model of a simulated person to control the selection of responses to a user selected statement, they do not render obvious the independent claims or, as a result, dependent claims 3, 7, 8, 11-13, 16, 23-34, 36, 37, 49, 50, and 52 either.

c. The Examiner has rejected claims 60, 64, and 65 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harless (US 5730603)(sic).

Because neither Harless nor Best disclose or suggest a system that utilizes a personality profile emulator comprising an emotional model of a simulated person to control the selection of responses to a user selected statement, they cannot render obvious claims 60, 64, and 65.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant submits that each of the presently pending claims in this application is in immediate condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested. Allowance of claims 1-16, 22-37, 43, 49, 50, 52, and 60-65 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis A. Cooch

Francis A. Cooch
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,495

Date October 4, 2002

FACooch/cfc
(240) 228-5640

Enclosure: "Clean" version of claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 22, 23, 35, 36, 43, and 60-65